Supplemental Materials

Cultural Variation in Social Judgments of Smiles: The Role of Ideal Affect

by J. L. Tsai et al., 2018, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*

http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/pspp0000192

Table of Contents

Section 1. *FaceGen Parameters for Study 1a Stimuli*

Expression	Calm	Moderate	Excited
SmileClosed	0.50	0.55	0.60
SmileOpen	0	0.50	1.00
EyeSquint Left	0	0.10	0.20
EyeSquint Right	0	0.10	0.20
Phoneme:aah	0	0.30	0.50
Phoneme:big aah	0	0	0.10
Phoneme: D, S, T	0	0.30	0.50

Section 2. *Means (SD) and analyses with moderate faces for Study 1a*

Social Judgment	European Americans (n = 65)			Hong Kong Chinese (n = 68)		
	Excited	Moderate	Calm	Excited	Moderate	Calm
Extraversion	3.86 (.66)	3.21 (.50)	2.71 (.46)	3.50 (.72)	3.15 (.48)	3.02 (.49)
Agreeableness	3.35 (.66)	3.22 (.60)	3.12 (.56)	3.10 (.58)	3.09 (.48)	3.15 (.55)
Dominance	2.91 (.83)	2.55 (.60)	2.59 (.57)	2.86 (.56)	2.74 (.55)	2.74 (.60)
Competence	3.04 (.58)	3.19 (.45)	3.37 (.51)	2.96 (.59)	3.09 (.45)	3.17 (.39)

We conducted 2 [Judge Culture (European American, Hong Kong Chinese)] X 3 [Target Expression (excited, moderate, calm)] X 2 [Target Race (White, Asian)] X 2 [Target Sex (male, female)] repeated-measures analyses of variance on social judgments; Judge Culture was treated as a between subjects factor; Target Expression, Target Race, and Target Sex were treated as within subjects factors. Data were dropped for one Hong Kong Chinese participant due to missing social judgments for one target identity.

Extraversion. There was a significant main effect of Target Expression, $F(1.60, 207.89) = 102.75$, $p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .44$, Huynh-Feldt correction[1]. Overall, excited faces were rated as more extraverted ($M = 3.69$, $SE = .06$) than moderate faces ($M = 3.17$, $SE = .04$), $p < .001$, 95% CI for difference = [.41, .62]. Moderate faces, in turn, were rated as more extraverted than calm faces ($M = 2.86$, $SE = .04$), $p < .001$, 95% CI for difference = [.22, .41]. However, this main effect was qualified by a significant Judge Culture X Target Expression interaction, $F(1.60, 207.89) = 15.71$, $p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .11$.

As predicted, European Americans ($M = 3.86$, $SE = .09$) rated excited faces as more extraverted than did Hong Kong Chinese ($M = 3.51$, $SE = .08$), $p = .004$, 95% CI for difference = [.11, .59]. Moreover, Hong Kong Chinese ($M = 3.01$, $SE = .06$) rated calm faces as more extraverted than European Americans ($M = 2.71$, $SE = .06$), $p < .001$, 95% CI for difference =

[1] In the repeated-measures ANOVA, when sphericity was violated and epsilon was greater than .75, the Huynh-Feldt correction was reported.

[.14, .47]. There were no cultural differences in judgments of moderate faces, p = .43, 95% CI for difference = [-.10, .24] (European American: M = 3.21, SE = .06; Hong Kong Chinese: M = 3.14, SE = .06).

Within cultures, European Americans rated excited faces as more extraverted than moderate faces, p < .001, 95% CI for difference = [.51, .81], and moderate faces as more extraverted than calm faces, p < .001, 95% CI for difference = [.37, .64]. Similarly, Hong Kong Chinese rated excited faces as more extraverted than moderate faces, p < .001, 95% CI for difference = [.23, .52]. Hong Kong Chinese, however, rated moderate faces as marginally more extraverted than calm faces, p = .06, 95% CI for difference = [-.004, .26]. There was, however, an unpredicted Judge Culture X Target Expression X Target Gender interaction (p = .04); inspection of the means revealed that this was driven by European Americans, who overall rated the moderate male target as more extraverted than the moderate female target.

Agreeableness. There were no significant main effects of Target Expression, F(1.72, 224.08) = 1.54, p = .22, partial η^2 = .01, or Judge Culture, F(1, 130) = 2.34, p = .13, partial η^2 = .02. However, the Judge Culture X Target Expression interaction was marginally significant, F(1.72, 224.08) = 2.79, p = .07, partial η^2 = .02. Pairwise comparisons revealed that across cultures, European Americans rated excited faces as more agreeable (M = 3.35, SE = .08) than did Hong Kong Chinese (M = 3.11, SE = .08), p = .03, 95% CI for difference = [.03, .46]. There were no cultural differences in agreeableness judgments of moderate faces p = .17, 95% CI for difference = [-.06, .32] (European American: M = 3.22, SE = .07; Hong Kong Chinese: M = 3.09, SE = .07). Likewise, there were no cultural differences in agreeableness judgments of calm faces, p = .79, 95% CI for difference = [-.22, .17] European American: M = 3.12, SE = .07; Hong Kong Chinese: M = 3.15, SE = .07).

Dominance. There was a significant main effect of Target Expression, F(1.78, 231.07) = 11.78, p < .001, partial η^2 = .08. Excited faces were rated as more dominant (M = 2.89, SE = .06)

than moderate faces (*M* = 2.64, *SE* = .05), *p* < .001, 95% CI for difference = [.14, .36] and calm faces (*M* = 2.66, *SE* = .05), *p* = .001, 95% CI for difference = [.10, .37]. However, the Judge Culture X Target Expression interaction was not significant, *F*(1.78, 231.07) = 2.04, *p* = .14, partial η^2 = .02, and there were no other main effects or interaction effects including Judge Culture and Target Expression (*ps* > .29).

Competence. There was a significant main effect of Target Expression, *F*(1.76, 228.33) = 17.26, *p* < .001, partial η^2 = .12. Calm faces were rated as more competent (*M* = 3.27, *SE* = .04) than both moderate faces (*M* = 3.14, *SE* = .04), *p* = .001, 95% CI for difference = [.05, .20], and excited faces (*M* = 3.01, *SE* = .05), *p* < .001, 95% CI for difference = [.16, .37]. Moderate faces were also rated as more competent than excited faces, *p* = .003, 95% CI for difference = [.05, .22]. The Judge Culture X Target Expression interaction, however, was not significant, *F*(1.76, 228.33) = 1.16, *p* = .31, partial η^2 = .01, and there were no other significant main effects or interaction effects including Judge Culture and Target Expression (*ps* > .08).

Section 3. *Means (SD) and analyses with neutral faces for Study 1b*

Social Judgments	European Americans (n = 83)			Hong Kong Chinese (n = 81)		
	Excited	Calm	Neutral	Excited	Calm	Neutral
Extraversion	3.51 (.47)	3.23 (.39)	2.28 (.49)	3.29 (.65)	3.15 (.61)	2.15 (.51)
Agreeableness	3.44 (.54)	3.26 (.47)	2.18 (.55)	3.09 (.66)	3.13 (.66)	2.07 (.53)
Dominance	2.77 (.49)	2.77 (.47)	3.29 (.53)	2.72 (.58)	2.78 (.48)	2.92 (.69)
Competence	3.13 (.41)	3.06 (.44)	3.31 (.45)	2.86 (.57)	2.97 (.54)	2.77 (.60)

To test whether European Americans rate excited (vs. calm) faces as more extraverted than Hong Kong Chinese, we conducted 2 [Judge Culture (European American, Hong Kong Chinese)] X 3 [Target Expression (excited, calm, neutral)] X 2 [Target Race (White, Asian)] X 2 [Target Sex (male, female)] repeated-measures analyses of variance; Culture of Judge was a between subjects factor; the rest were within subjects factors. Data were dropped from one European American participant and one Hong Kong Chinese participant due to missing social judgments for one target identity.

Extraversion. There was a significant main effect of Target Expression, $F(1.64, 261.88) = 317.34$, $p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .67$. Overall, excited faces were rated as more extraverted ($M = 3.39$, $SE = .04$) than calm faces ($M = 3.18$, $SE = .04$), $p < .001$, 95% CI for difference = [.13, .28]. Calm faces, in turn, were rated as more extraverted than neutral faces ($M = 2.21$, $SE = .04$), $p < .001$, 95% CI for difference = [.88, 1.08]. Additionally, there was a significant main effect of Judge Culture, $F(1, 160) = 7.84$, $p = .01$, partial $\eta^2 = .05$. European Americans rated faces as more extraverted overall ($M = 3.01$, $SE = .04$) than did Hong Kong Chinese ($M = 2.85$, $SE = .04$), $p = .01$, 95% CI for difference = [.05, .27]. While the Judge Culture X Target Expression interaction was not significant, $F(1.64, 261.88) = 1.37$, $p = .25$, partial $\eta^2 = .01$, pairwise comparisons revealed that European Americans ($M = 3.52$, $SE = .06$) rated excited faces as significantly more extraverted than did Hong Kong Chinese ($M = 3.26$, $SE = .06$), $p = .004$, 95%

CI for difference = [.08, 42]. There were, however, no significant cultural differences in judgments of calm faces, p = .26, 95% CI for difference = [-.07, .25] (European American: M = 3.23, SE = .06; Hong Kong Chinese: M = 3.14, SE = .06) or judgments of neutral faces, p = .08, 95% CI for difference = [-.02, .29] (European American: M = 2.27, SE = .05; Hong Kong Chinese: M = 2.14, SE = .06). There were no other significant interaction effects involving Judge Culture and Target Expression (ps > .27).

Agreeableness. There was a significant main effect of Target Expression, F(1.74, 277.62) = 254.26, p < .001, partial η^2 = .61. Excited faces were rated as more agreeable (M = 3.26, SE = .05) than neutral faces (M = 2.12, SE = .04), p < .001, 95% CI for difference = [1.02, 1.27]. Similarly, calm faces were rated as more agreeable (M = 3.19, SE = .05) than neutral faces, p < .001, 95% CI for difference = [.95, 1.19], and there was no difference between excited and calm faces, p = .12, 95% CI for difference = [-.02, .16]. There was also a significant main effect of Judge Culture, F(1, 160) = 12.67, p < .001, partial η^2 = .07. Overall, European Americans rated the faces as more agreeable (M = 2.96, SE = .04) compared to Hong Kong Chinese (M = 2.75, SE = .04), p < .001, 95% CI for difference = [.10, .33]. The Judge Culture X Target Expression interaction was marginally significant, F(1.74, 277.62) = 3.11, p = .05, partial η^2 = .02.

European Americans (M = 3.45, SE = .07) rated excited faces as more agreeable than did Hong Kong Chinese (M = 3.07, SE = .07), p < .001, 95% CI for difference = [.19, .56]. There were no cultural differences in judgments of calm faces, p = .12, 95% CI for difference = [-.04, .32] (European American: M = 3.26, SE = .06; Hong Kong Chinese: M = 3.12, SE = .06), or in judgments of neutral faces, p = .14, 95% CI for difference = [-.04, .29] (European American: M = 2.18, SE = .06; Hong Kong Chinese: M = 2.06, SE = .06).

Within cultures, European Americans rated excited faces as more agreeable than calm faces, p = .003, 95% CI for difference = [.07, .31]. They also rated calm faces as more

agreeable than neutral faces, $p < .001$, 95% CI for difference = [.91, 1.25]. Hong Kong Chinese rated excited faces as more agreeable than neutral faces, $p < .001$, 95% CI for difference = [.84, 1.19]. Similarly, they rated calm faces as more agreeable than neutral faces, $p < .001$, 95% CI for difference = [.84, 1.19]. However, Hong Kong Chinese did not differentiate between excited and calm faces, $p = .42$, 95% CI for difference = [-.17, .07].

Dominance. There was a significant main effect of Target Expression, $F(1.86, 298.07) = 29.79$, $p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .16$. Neutral faces were rated as more dominant ($M = 3.11$, $SE = .05$) than excited faces ($M = 2.74$, $SE = .04$), $p < .001$, 95% CI for difference = [.25, .48] and calm faces ($M = 2.77$, $SE = .04$), $p < .001$, 95% CI for difference = [.23, .45]. There was also a significant main effect of Judge Culture, $F(1, 160) = 6.22$, $p = .01$, partial $\eta^2 = .04$ such that European Americans rated faces as overall more dominant ($M = 2.95$, $SE = .04$) compared to Hong Kong Chinese ($M = 2.80$, $SE = .04$), $p = .01$, 95% CI for difference = [.03, .27].

These main effects, however, were qualified by a significant Judge Culture X Target Expression interaction, $F(1.86, 298.07) = 8.16$, $p = .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .05$. European Americans rated neutral faces ($M = 3.30$, $SE = .07$) as more dominant than Hong Kong Chinese ($M = 2.91$, $SE = .07$), $p < .001$, 95% CI for difference = [.20, .58]. However, there were no significant differences in dominance judgments of excited faces, $p = .46$, 95% CI for difference = [-.10, .23] (European American: $M = 2.77$, $SE = .06$; Hong Kong Chinese: $M = 2.71$, $SE = .06$) or calm faces, $p = .91$, 95% CI for difference = [-.16, .14] (European American: $M = 2.77$, $SE = .05$; Hong Kong Chinese: $M = 2.77$, $SE = .05$).

Within cultures, European Americans rated neutral faces as more dominant than excited faces, $p < .001$, 95% CI for difference = [.37, .69], as well as calm faces, $p < .001$, 95% CI for difference = [.38, .69]. Similarly, Hong Kong Chinese rated neutral faces as more dominant than excited faces, $p = .01$, 95% CI for difference = [.04, .37], but as dominant as calm faces, $p = .09$, 95% CI for difference = [-.02, .29].

Competence. There was a significant main effect of Judge Culture, $F(1, 160) = 28.37$, $p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .15$, such that European Americans rated the faces as more competent overall ($M = 3.16$, $SE = .04$) compared with Hong Kong Chinese ($M = 2.84$, $SE = .04$), $p < .001$, 95% CI for difference = [.20, .43]. This main effect, however, was qualified by a significant interaction between Judge Culture and Target Expression, $F(1.90, 304.40) = 13.55$, $p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .08$. European Americans rated excited faces as more competent ($M = 3.13$, $SE = .05$) compared to Hong Kong Chinese ($M = 2.84$, $SE = .05$), $p < .001$, 95% CI for difference = [.14, .44]. European Americans also rated neutral faces as more competent ($M = 3.30$, $SE = .06$) than Hong Kong Chinese ($M = 2.75$, $SE = .06$), $p < .001$, 95% CI for difference = [.39, .71]. There were no cultural differences in competence judgments of calm faces, $p = .14$, 95% CI for difference = [-.04, .25] (European American: $M = 3.05$, $SE = .05$; Hong Kong Chinese: $M = 2.94$, $SE = .05$).

Within cultures, European Americans rated neutral faces as more competent than excited faces, $p = .01$, 95% CI for difference = [.05, .30] and calm faces, $p < .001$, 95% CI for difference = [.13, .37]. In contrast, Hong Kong Chinese rated calm faces as more competent than excited faces, $p = .04$, 95% CI for difference = [.003, .21] and neutral faces, $p = .003$, 95% CI for difference = [.07, .31].

Section 4. Emotion ratings of video stimuli for Study 3.

To test whether the stimuli conveyed the intended emotions, we asked participants to choose the emotion that best described how the applicant was feeling (i.e., angry, disgusted, afraid, sad, calm, excited, surprised, neutral). As predicted, the majority of both groups (European American = 92.9%, Hong Kong Chinese = 51%) rated the excited applicant as feeling "excited." However, there were differences between cultural groups in the perception of the excited applicant's emotions, $\chi^2(6, N = 198) = 43.88$, $p < .001$, Cramer's V = .47 with Hong Kong Chinese being more variable in their emotion ratings of the excited applicant (see below for proportions within the ethnic group). Similarly, the majority of both groups (European American = 85.7%, Hong Kong Chinese = 61%) rated the calm applicant as feeling "calm." However, Hong Kong Chinese showed more variation in the emotions they rated the calm applicant experiencing, $\chi^2(5, N = 198) = 18.49$, $p = .002$, Cramer's V = .31. Finally, 53.1% of European American and 33% of Hong Kong Chinese saw the neutral candidate as experiencing a "neutral" state. We also found cultural differences between groups, $\chi^2(6, N = 198) = 19.03$, $p = .004$, Cramer's V = .31, with 24.5% of European Americans and 49% of Hong Kong Chinese rating the neutral candidate as feeling "calm".

	European American				*Hong Kong Chinese*		
	Excited	Calm	Neutral		Excited	Calm	Neutral
Angry	0%	0%	2%	Angry	0	0%	0%
Disgusted	0%	0%	1%	Disgusted	6%	0%	3%
Afraid	0%	1%	8.2%	Afraid	3%	3%	6%
Sad	0%	0%	5.1%	Sad	1%	2%	1%
Calm	4.1%	85.7%	24.5%	Calm	18%	61%	49%
Excited	92.9%	4.1%	6.1%	Excited	51%	8%	8%
Surprised	0%	1%	0%	Surprised	3%	0%	0%
Neutral	3.1%	8.2%	53.1%	Neutral	18%	26%	33%

Section 5. *Factor analyses with all items for Studies 1a, 1b, 2, and 3*

Factor analyses were conducted on all the relevant items included in each study.

Study 1a

We conducted an exploratory factor analysis on seven social judgment items using a Principal Components Analysis with Varimax (orthogonal) rotation with extraction based on Eigenvalues greater than 1. Three factors emerged: (1) *competence* (intelligent, competent, successful), (2) *dominance* (dominant, assertive), and *affiliation* (friendly, extraverted, agreeable). To maintain consistency with previous studies of the interpersonal circumplex (Wiggins, 1995) and the other studies in this paper, we included friendly with extraverted to index extraversion, and analyzed agreeableness separately.

	Factors			
Items	Competence	Dominance	Affiliation	Communalities
Intelligent	0.88			0.80
Competent	0.81			0.73
Successful	0.79			0.74
Dominant		0.90		0.86
Assertive		0.88		0.83
Friendly			0.88	0.82
Extraverted		0.51	0.66	0.70
Agreeable	0.34		0.75	0.67
Eigenvalues	2.28	1.97	1.89	
Percentage of Total Variance	28.52%	24.63%	23.65%	
Total Variance	76.80%			

Study 1b

We conducted an exploratory factor analysis on the 15 social judgment items using a Principal Components Analysis with Varimax (orthogonal) rotation with extraction based on Eigenvalues greater than 1. Three factors emerged: (1) *agreeableness* (trustworthy, humble, respectful, virtuous, cooperative, accommodating, agreeable, warm), (2) *dominance*/*competence* (dominant, assertive, competent, intelligent), and (3) *extraversion* (extraverted, friendly, charismatic). Friendly loaded on agreeableness and extraversion, but we included it with extraversion to be consistent with the other studies and previous work on the interpersonal circumplex (Wiggins, 1995).

	Factors			
Items	Agreeableness	Dominance/ Competence	Extraversion	Communalities
Trustworthy	0.79			0.70
Humble	0.79			0.64
Respectful	0.78			0.66
Virtuous	0.75			0.65
Cooperative	0.72		0.46	0.73
Accommodating	0.71		0.49	0.74
Agreeable	0.69		0.53	0.76
Warm	0.64		0.61	0.79
Dominant		0.83		0.75
Assertive		0.82		0.72
Competent	0.41	0.75		0.74
Intelligent	0.39	0.75		0.71
Extraverted			0.85	0.80
Friendly	0.66		0.59	0.79
Charismatic	0.37	0.50	0.52	0.65
Eigenvalues	5.33	2.93	2.58	
% of Total Variance	35.54%	19.55%	17.23%	

Total Variance	72.32%

Study 2

We conducted an exploratory factor analysis on the five social judgment items using a Principal Components Analysis with Varimax (orthogonal) rotation with extraction based on Eigenvalues greater than 1. Two factors emerged as follows: (1) *competence* (intelligent, competent, and successful) and (2) *extraversion* (extraverted, friendly).

	Factors		
Items	Competence	Extraversion	Communalities
Intelligent	0.87		0.78
Competent	0.86		0.76
Successful	0.83		0.74
Extraverted		0.90	0.82
Friendly		0.71	0.64
Eigenvalues	2.32	1.42	
% of Total Variance	46.29%	28.45%	
Total Variance	74.74%		

Study 3

We conducted an exploratory factor analysis with the 20 social judgment items using a Principal Components Analysis with Varimax (orthogonal) rotation with extraction based on Eigenvalues greater than 1. Three factors emerged as follows: (1) *agreeableness* (trustworthy, honest, authentic, accommodating, agreeable, humble, virtuous, respectful, warm), (2) *extraversion/dominance* (extraverted, charismatic, friendly, confident, dominant, assertive), and (3) *competence* (educated, skilled, experienced, intelligent, competent). Warm loaded on both agreeableness and extraversion, but we included it with agreeableness to be consistent with Study 1b and previous studies of the interpersonal circumplex (Wiggins, 1995).

	Agreeableness	Extraversion /Dominance	Competence	Communality
Trustworthy	0.79			0.71
Honest	0.77			0.66
Authentic	0.75			0.62
Accommodating	0.73			0.60
Agreeable	0.72	0.33		0.63
Humble	0.70			0.56
Virtuous	0.70			0.57
Respectful	0.57		0.44	0.54
Warm	0.40	0.70		0.66
Charismatic		0.83		0.75
Extraverted		0.82		0.71
Confident		0.77	0.30	0.69
Friendly	0.46	0.74		0.76
Dominant		0.69		0.53
Assertive		0.67	0.36	0.58
Educated			0.75	0.60
Skilled		0.31	0.74	0.71
Experienced			0.72	0.67
Intelligent			0.69	0.63
Competent	0.36	0.33	0.69	0.71
Eigenvalues	8.58	2.82	1.51	
% of Total Variance	42.88%	14.09%	7.55%	
Total Variance	64.51%			

Section 6: Analyses with full aggregates for Studies 1a, 1b, 2, & 3

Study 1a

Analyses for extraversion, agreeableness, and dominance are the same as reported in the text of the main body of the manuscript. Results for the full competence aggregate are reported below. In the manuscript, the competence aggregate included competent and intelligent; however, the full aggregate included competent, intelligent, and successful.

Means (SD)

Social judgments	European Americans (n = 65)		Hong Kong Chinese (n = 68)	
	Excited	Calm	Excited	Calm
Competence	3.02 (.57)	3.29 (.49)	2.93 (.58)	3.11 (.38)

We conducted 2 [Judge Culture (European American, Hong Kong Chinese)] X 2 [Target Expression (excited, calm)] X 2 [Target Race (White, Asian)] X 2 [Target Sex (male, female)] repeated measures ANOVAs on competence; Judge Culture was treated as a between subjects factor; the rest were treated as within subjects factors. As described above in Section 2, data were dropped from one Hong Kong Chinese participant due to missing social judgments for one target identity.

There was a significant main effect of Target Expression, $F(1, 130) = 17.92$, $p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .12$. Calm faces were rated as more competent ($M = 3.20$, $SE = .04$) than excited faces ($M = 2.98$, $SE = .05$), $p < .001$, 95% CI for difference = [.11, .32]. The Judge Culture X Target Expression interaction, however, was not significant, $F(1, 130) = 1.00$, $p = .32$, partial $\eta^2 = .01$, and there were no other significant main effects or interaction effects involving Judge Culture and Target Expression (*ps* > .07).

Study 1b

Analyses for dominance and competence are the same as reported in the text of the main body of the manuscript. Results for extraversion and agreeableness are reported below. In the manuscript, the extraversion aggregate included extraverted and friendly and the agreeableness aggregate included warm and agreeable. Below, the full extraversion aggregate included extraverted, friendly, and charismatic, and the full agreeableness aggregate included warm, agreeable, accommodating, cooperative, virtuous, respectful, humble, and trustworthy.

Means (SD)

Social judgments	European Americans (n = 83)		Hong Kong Chinese (n = 81)	
	Excited	Calm	Excited	Calm
Extraversion	3.40 (.45)	3.14 (.38)	3.07 (.60)	3.00 (.58)
Agreeableness	3.27 (.40)	3.15 (.38)	2.98 (.55)	3.06 (.59)

As in Study 1a, we conducted 2 [Judge Culture (European American, Hong Kong Chinese)] X 2 [Target Expression (excited, calm)] X 2 [Target Race (White, Asian)] X 2 [Target Sex (male, female)] repeated-measures ANOVAs on social judgments; Judge Culture was treated as a between subjects factor; the rest were within subjects factors.

Extraversion. There was a significant main effect of Target Expression, $F(1, 162) = 22.24$, $p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .12$. Overall, excited faces were rated as more extraverted ($M = 3.24$, $SE = .04$) than calm faces ($M = 3.07$, $SE = .04$), $p < .001$, 95% CI for difference = [.10, .24]. Additionally, there was a significant main effect of Judge Culture, $F(1, 162) = 10.93$, $p = .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .06$. European Americans rated the faces overall as more extraverted ($M = 3.27$, $SE = .05$) than did Hong Kong Chinese ($M = 3.04$, $SE = .05$), $p = .001$, 95% CI for difference = [.09, .37]. These main effects, however, were qualified by a significant Judge Culture X Target Expression interaction, $F(1, 162) = 7.38$, $p = .01$, partial $\eta^2 = .04$.

As predicted and consistent with Study 1a, European Americans (M = 3.40, SE = .06) rated excited faces as more extraverted than did Hong Kong Chinese (M = 3.07, SE = .06), p < .001, 95% CI for difference = [.17, .49]. Unlike Study 1a, however, there were no significant cultural differences in judgments of calm targets, p = .07, 95% CI = [-.01, .29] (European American: M = 3.14, SE = .05; Hong Kong Chinese: M = 3.00, SE = .05).

Within cultures, European Americans rated excited faces as more extraverted than calm faces, p < .001, 95% CI for difference = [.17, .36]. However, there were no significant differences in Hong Kong Chinese extraversion judgments of excited and calm faces, p = .16, 95% CI for difference = [-.03, .17]. A t-test revealed that the difference in extraversion judgments of excited (vs. calm) faces was greater for European Americans (M = .26, SE = .05) than for Hong Kong Chinese (M = .07, SE = .05), $t(162) = 2.72$, p = .01, 95% CI for difference = [.05, .33], *Cohen's d* = .42. These findings did not vary as a function of Target Race or Target Sex (ps >.56).

Agreeableness. Analyses revealed a significant main effect of Judge Culture, $F(1, 162) = 7.78$, p = .01, partial η^2 = .05. Overall, European Americans rated the faces as higher in agreeableness (M = 3.21, SE = .05) compared to Hong Kong Chinese (M = 3.02, SE = .05), p = .01, 95% CI for difference = [.06, .32]. This main effect, however, was qualified by a significant Judge Culture X Target Expression interaction, $F(1, 162) = 6.84$, p = .01, partial η^2 = .04.

As predicted and consistent with Study 1a, European Americans rated excited faces (M = 3.27, SE = .05) as more agreeable than did Hong Kong Chinese (M = 2.98, SE = .05), p < .001, 95% CI for difference = [.13, .43]. As in Study 1a, there were no cultural differences in judgments of calm faces, p = .21, 95% CI for difference = [-.06, .25] (European American: M = 3.15, SE = .06; Hong Kong Chinese: M = 3.06, SE = .06).

Within cultures, European Americans rated excited faces as more agreeable than calm faces, p = .03, 95% CI for difference = [.01, .21], but again Hong Kong Chinese did not differ in

their agreeableness judgments of excited and calm faces, p = .15, 95% CI for difference = [-.17, .03]. Moreover, a t-test revealed that the difference in agreeableness judgments of excited (vs. calm) faces was greater for European Americans (M = .11, SE = .05) than for Hong Kong Chinese (M = -.07, SE = .05), t(162) = 2.62, p = .01, 95% CI for difference = [.04, .32], *Cohen's* d = .40.

Hypothesis 2: Are Cultural Differences in Judgments of Extraversion and Agreeableness Mediated By Ideal HAP?

Unlike Study 1a, there were no significant cultural differences in ideal HAP or ideal LAP, controlling for actual HAP and LAP, *ps* > .78 (European American: ideal HAP M = .59, SE = .05, ideal LAP = 1.08, SE = .04; Hong Kong Chinese: ideal HAP M = .61, SE = .05, ideal LAP = 1.07, SE = .04). Thus, because the two cultural groups did not differ significantly in self-reports of ideal affect, we collapsed across cultural groups and examined whether individual differences in ideal HAP could predict extraversion and agreeableness ratings of the excited target.

In a stepwise linear regression, we entered Judge Culture (European American = 1, Hong Kong Chinese = -1) as the independent variable in the first model, with extraversion judgments of excited faces as the dependent variable. We then added ideal HAP, controlling for actual HAP, as independent variables in the second model. The first model was significant, F(1, 162) = 16.10, p < .001, adjusted R^2 = .09, as was the second model, F(3, 160) = 9.69, p < .001, adjusted R^2 = .14. Moreover, the addition of ideal and actual HAP significantly improved model fit, ΔF(2, 160) = 5.98, p = .003, ΔR^2 = .06. Consistent with our previous results, Judge Culture was a significant predictor, B = .17, SE = .04, ß = .31, t = 4.29, p < .001. Supporting our hypotheses, ideal HAP was also significantly associated with extraversion judgments of the excited target, B = .16, SE = .06, ß = .21, t = 2.64, p = .01: the more participants valued HAP, the more they rated excited faces as extraverted. In contrast, actual HAP was <u>not</u> associated with extraversion judgments, B = .08, SE = .08, ß = .08, t = 1.02, p = .31.

We conducted similar analyses to see if ideal HAP predicted agreeableness judgments of the excited targets. Again, the first model was significant, $F(1, 162) = 14.04$, $p < .001$, adjusted $R^2 = .07$, as was the second model, $F(3, 160) = 9.53$, $p < .001$, adjusted $R^2 = .14$. The addition of ideal and actual HAP significantly improved model fit, $\Delta F(2, 160) = 6.77$, $p = .002$, $\Delta R^2 = .07$. Judge Culture significantly predicted agreeableness judgments, $B = .15$, $SE = .04$, ß = .29, $t = 3.99$, $p < .001$. Although in the predicted direction, ideal HAP was not significantly associated with agreeableness judgments of excited faces, $B = .09$, $SE = .06$, ß = .13, $t = 1.59$, $p = .11$. Actual HAP, however was a significant predictor, $B = .18$, $SE = .07$, ß = .19, $t = 2.42$, $p = .02$, such that the more participants actually feel HAP, the more agreeable they rated excited faces.

Study 2

Analyses for extraversion judgments are the same as reported in the text of the main body of the manuscript. Results for the full competence aggregate (competent, intelligent, and successful) are reported below.

Means (SD)

Social judgments	European Americans (n = 61)		Hong Kong Chinese (n = 95)	
	Excited	Calm	Excited	Calm
Competence	3.40 (.49)	3.36 (.46)	3.00 (.46)	2.99 (.44)

We conducted 2 [Judge Culture (European American, Hong Kong Chinese)] X 2 [Target Expression (excited, calm)] X 2 [Target Race (White, Asian)] X 2 [Target Sex (male, female)] repeated measures ANOVAs on competence judgments; Judge Culture was a between subjects factor, while the other factors were within subjects factors.

There was a significant main effect of Judge Culture, $F(1, 154) = 31.75$, $p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .17$. European Americans reported overall higher competence judgments ($M = 3.38$, SE

= .05) than did Hong Kong Chinese (*M* = 2.99, *SE* = .04), $p < .001$, 95% CI for difference = [.25, .52]. However, the main effect of Target Expression was not significant, $F(1, 154) = .73$, $p = .40$, partial $\eta^2 = .01$. Similarly, the Judge Culture X Target Expression interaction was not significant, $F(1, 154) = .16$, $p = .69$, partial $\eta^2 = .001$.

Study 3

In the manuscript, the extraversion aggregate included extraverted and friendly; the agreeableness aggregate included warm and agreeable; the dominance aggregate included dominant and assertive; and the competence aggregate included intelligent and competent. Below, the full extraversion aggregate included extraversion and dominance items (extraverted, charismatic, confident, friendly, dominant, assertive); the full agreeableness aggregate included warm, authentic, agreeable, accommodating, virtuous, respectful, humble, honest, and trustworthy; and the full competence aggregate included items that we used as a stimulus check (intelligent, competent, educated, skilled, and experienced).

Social judgments	European Americans (n = 98)			Hong Kong Chinese (n = 100)		
	Excited	Calm	Neutral	Excited	Calm	Neutral
Extraversion	3.91 (.61)	3.12 (.75)	2.46 (.74)	3.49 (.66)	3.20 (.64)	3.13 (.69)
Agreeableness	3.32 (.70)	3.50 (.62)	3.22 (.63)	3.17 (.63)	3.47 (.60)	3.26 (.65)
Competence	3.56 (.68)	3.54 (.70)	3.47 (.65)	3.29 (.62)	3.33 (.65)	3.26 (.66)

Hypothesis 1: Do European Americans rate excited applicants as more extraverted and agreeable than Hong Kong Chinese?

We conducted a 2 [Judge Culture (European American, Hong Kong Chinese)] X 3 [Target Expression (excited, calm, neutral)] repeated measures analysis of variance (ANOVA) on each social judgment (extraversion, agreeableness, competence); Judge Culture was treated as a between-subjects factor, and Target Expression was treated as a within-subject factor.

Extraversion. There was a significant main effect of Target Expression, $F(2, 392) = 121.10$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .38$. Excited applicants ($M = 3.70$, $SE = .05$) were rated as the most extraverted followed by calm applicants ($M = 3.16$, $SE = .05$) and then neutral applicants ($M = 2.79$, $SE = .05$); ps < .001. The main effect of Judge Culture was not significant, $F(1, 196) = 2.55$, $p = .11$, $\eta^2 = .01$. However, as predicted, the Judge Culture X Target Expression interaction was significant, $F(2, 392) = 43.04$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .18$.

As predicted and consistent with Studies 1 and 2, pairwise comparisons revealed that European Americans rated the excited applicant ($M = 3.91$, $SE = .06$) as more extraverted than did Hong Kong Chinese ($M = 3.49$, SE = .06), $p < .001$, 95% CI for difference = [.24, .60]. Consistent with Studies 1b and 2, there were no differences between European Americans and Hong Kong Chinese in extraversion judgments of the calm applicant (European American $M = 3.12$, $SE = .07$; Hong Kong $M = 3.20$, $SE = .07$), $p = .40$, 95% CI for difference = [-.28, .11]. However, Hong Kong Chinese rated the neutral applicant as more extraverted than did European Americans (European American $M = 2.46$, $SE = .07$; Hong Kong Chinese: $M = 3.13$, $SE = .07$), $p < .001$, 95% CI for difference = .47, .87].

Within cultures, European Americans and Hong Kong Chinese both rated the excited applicant as more extraverted than the calm applicant, and the calm applicant as more extraverted than the neutral applicant. However, as in the two previous studies, the difference between the excited and calm applicants in extraversion judgments was greater for European Americans than for Hong Kong Chinese (European American $M = .79$, $SE = .09$; Hong Kong Chinese $M = .29$, $SE = .08$), $t(196) = 4.34$, $p < .001$, 95% CI for difference = [.27, .73], Cohen's $d = .62$.

Agreeableness. There was a significant main effect of Target Expression, $F(2, 392) = 15.66$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .07$. The calm applicant ($M = 3.48$, S.E. = .04) was rated as more agreeable than the excited applicant ($M = 3.24$, $SE = .05$), $p < .001$, 95% CI for difference =

[.15, .34], and the neutral applicant (*M* = 3.24, *SE* = .05), *p* < .001, 95% CI for difference = [.15, .34], who did not differ from each other, *p* = .94. The main effect of Judge Culture, *F*(1, 196) = .48, *p* = .49, η^2 = .002, and the Judge Culture X Target Expression interaction, however, were not significant, *F*(2, 392) = 1.70, *p* = .18, η^2 = .009. Planned pairwise comparisons revealed no cultural differences in agreeableness judgments of the three applicants, *p* = .13 to .67. Within cultures, European Americans and Hong Kong Chinese both rated the calm applicant as more agreeable than the excited and neutral applicants, *p*s < .007, and the difference between the excited and calm applicants in judgments of agreeableness was similar for European Americans and Hong Kong Chinese (European American *M* = -.26, *SE* = .07; Hong Kong Chinese *M* = -.35, *SE* = .07), *t*(196) = .88, *p* = .38, 95% CI for difference = [-.11, .28], Cohen's *d* = .12.

Competence. There were no differences in competence judgments based on Target Expression, *F*(2, 392) = 1.22, *p* = .30, η^2 = .006. There was a main effect of Judge Culture, *F*(1, 196) = 9.67, *p* = .002, η^2 = .05, with European Americans (*M* = 3.52, *SE* = .05) rating all applicants as more competent than Hong Kong Chinese (*M* = 3.29, *SE* = .05), *p* = .002, 95% CI for difference = [.09, .38]. However, the Target Expression by Judge Culture interaction was not significant, *F*(2, 392) = .21, *p* = .81, η^2 = .001.

In sum, as predicted, European Americans rated the excited applicant as more extraverted than did Hong Kong Chinese. This pattern of results did not emerge for judgments of competence (likely because we matched applicants in terms of experience) or for agreeableness. Next, we examined whether cultural differences in choice of the excited applicant were due to these differences in social judgment.

Hypothesis 2: Are European Americans More Likely to Hire the Excited Applicant Than Hong Kong Chinese, and Is This Due to Differences in Judgments of Extraversion and Agreeableness?

As reported in the manuscript, we found cultural differences in hiring choice, such that European Americans were more likely to hire the excited applicant than Hong Kong Chinese

were. Even though we did not find cultural differences in agreeableness judgments of the excited applicant with the full aggregate, we tested whether judgments of extraversion and agreeableness mediated cultural differences in hiring choice to be consistent with the analyses in the body of the manuscript. Specifically, we used a multiple parallel multiple mediation model (Model 4, Process; Hayes, 2012; Hayes, 2013) that defined Judge Culture (-1=Hong Kong, 1=European American) as the independent variable, extraversion and agreeableness judgments of the excited applicant as parallel multiple mediators, and choice of the excited applicant (vs. the other two applicants) as the dependent variable. Results are based on 5000 bias-corrected bootstrapped resamples. As reported above, there was a significant total effect of Judge Culture on choice for the excited applicant, B = .39, SE = .15, Z = 2.58, p = .01, Wald = 6.67, with European Americans choosing the excited applicant more than Hong Kong Chinese. In addition, Judge Culture significantly predicted judgments of extraversion, B = .21, SE = .05, t = 4.63, p < .001, 95% CI = [.12, .30], but not agreeableness, B = .07, SE = .05, t = 1.54, p = .12, 95% CI = [-.02, .17], indicating that European Americans rated the excited applicant as more extraverted than did Hong Kong Chinese (as reported above).

Both agreeableness, B = .76, SE = .31, Z = 2.47, p = .01, 95% CI = [.16, 1.36], and extraversion, B = .79, SE = .31, Z = 2.52, p = .01, 95% CI = [.18, 1.40], judgments predicted choice of the excited applicant: the higher the excited applicant was rated on extraversion and agreeableness, the more likely he was to be hired. The direct effect of Judge Culture on choice of the excited applicant was no longer significant after parsing out the indirect effects of extraversion and agreeableness judgments (Model fit: -2 log likelihood = 228.79, p < .001, McFadden's R^2 = .13): B = .23, SE = .17, Z = 1.36, p = .17, 95% CI = [-.10, .55]. The indirect effect through extraversion judgments was significant, Effect = .17, SE = .08, 95% CI = [.03, .36], while the indirect effect through agreeableness judgments was not, Effect = .06, SE = .04, 95% CI = [-.01, .18]. Thus, extraversion judgments alone fully mediated cultural differences in choice of the excited applicant.

Hypothesis 3: Does Ideal HAP Predict Judgments of Extraversion and Choice of Excited Applicant?

As reported in the manuscript, we collapsed across cultural groups and examined the predicted link between ideal HAP and extraversion judgments of the excited applicant across cultures.

To examine whether ideal HAP also predicted choice of applicant, we used a mediation model (Model 4, Process) that defined ideal HAP (raw scores) as the independent variable, judgments of extraversion as the mediator, and choice of the excited applicant (vs. the other two applicants) as the dependent variable, controlling for actual HAP. Results are based on 5000 bias-corrected bootstrapped resamples. We found a significant indirect effect through extraversion judgments, Effect = .30, *SE* = .14, 95% CI = [.08, .61], despite there being no significant total effect of ideal HAP on choice, *B* = -.02, *SE* = .24, *Z* = -.1, *p* = .92, Wald = .01. Consistent with our previous results, ideal HAP predicted judgments of extraversion, *B* = .22, *SE* = .07, *t* = 2.88, *p* = .004, 95% CI = [.07, .36], such that those who valued HAP states more rated the excited applicant as more extraverted. Furthermore, extraversion judgments of excited applicants predicted choice of the excited applicant, *B* = 1.38, *SE* = .29, *Z* = 4.73, *p* < .001, 95% CI = [.81, 1.95], such that the higher the excited applicant was rated on extraversion, the more likely he was to be hired. Actual HAP did not predict judgments of extraversion, *p* = .87, 95% CI = [-.16, .13], or applicant choice, *p* = .88, 95% CI = [-.52, .45]. The direct effect of ideal HAP on choice remained non-significant after including extraversion judgments in the model (Model fit: -2 log likelihood = 234.40, *p* < .001, McFadden's R^2 = .11): *B* = -.36, *SE* = .27, *Z* = -1.36, *p* = .17, 95% CI = [-.89, .16]. Thus, ideal HAP did not directly influence choice of the excited applicant; instead, ideal HAP predicted extraversion judgments of the excited target, which in turn predicted increased likelihood of choosing the excited applicant.

Next, to determine whether judgments of agreeableness were related to ideal HAP, controlling for Judge Culture and actual HAP, we ran a stepwise multiple regression analysis in

which we defined Judge Culture (-1 = Hong Kong Chinese, 1 = European American) as the independent variable in the first model, and then added ideal HAP, controlling for actual HAP, as independent variables in the second model. While the first model was not significant, adjusted R^2 = .007, $F(1, 196) = 2.38$, p = .13, the second model was, adjusted R^2 = .05, $F(3, 194) = 4.13$, p = .01, indicating that adding ideal HAP and actual HAP significantly improved model fit, ΔR^2 = .05, $\Delta F(2, 194) = 4.95$, p = .01. However, while ideal HAP did not significantly predict agreeableness judgments, B = .05, SE = .08, β = .04, t = .60, p = .55, 95% CI = [-.10, .19], actual HAP did, B = .20, SE = .07, β = .20, t = 2.73, p = .007, 95% CI = [.06, .35].

Does Ideal Affect Predict Social Judgments of Neutral Applicant?

To examine whether extraversion and agreeableness judgments predicted choice of the neutral applicants, we ran a similar mediation model in which we defined Judge Culture (-1 = Hong Kong, 1 = European American) as the independent variable, judgments of extraversion and agreeableness as parallel multiple mediators, and choice of the neutral applicant (vs. the other two applicants) as the dependent variable. Judge Culture predicted extraversion, B = -.33, SE = .05, t = -6.60, $p < .001$, 95% CI = [-.43, -.23], but not agreeableness, B = -.02, SE = .05, t = -.43, p = .67, 95% CI = [-.11, .07] judgments of the neutral applicant, with Hong Kong Chinese rating the neutral applicant as more extraverted than European Americans.

The higher the neutral applicant was rated on extraversion, B = .82, SE = .35, Z = 2.34, p = .02, 95% CI = [.13, 1.51], and agreeableness, B = .91, SE = .41, Z = 2.23, p = .03, 95% CI = [.11, 1.70], the more likely he was to be hired. While the indirect effect of extraversion was significant, Effect = -.27, SE = .14, 95% CI = [-.60, -.04], the indirect effect of agreeableness was not, Effect = -.02, SE = .05, 95% CI = [-.13, .06]. The significant total effect of Judge Culture on choice of the neutral applicant, B = -.36, SE = .18, Z = -1.99, p = .047, Wald = 3.96, was no longer significant after entering extraversion and agreeableness judgments of the neutral applicant in the model (Model fit: -2 log likelihood = 174.70, $p < .001$, McFadden's R^2 = .15), Direct effect: B = -.10, SE = .22, Z = -.45, p = .66, 95% CI = [-.53, .33]. Thus, similar to

the results for excited applicants, extraversion judgments alone mediated cultural differences in choice of the neutral applicant.

To examine whether ideal LAP or ideal HAP predicted choice of neutral applicant through judgments of extraversion and agreeableness, we used a mediation model (Model 4, Process) that defined ideal LAP (or HAP; raw scores) as the independent variable, judgments of extraversion and agreeableness as parallel multiple mediators, and choice of the neutral applicant (vs. the other two applicants) as the dependent variable, controlling for actual LAP (or HAP). There was a significant indirect effect of ideal LAP through extraversion, Effect = -.12, *SE* = .08, 95% CI = [-.34, -.004], and a significant indirect effect of ideal HAP through agreeableness, Effect = .17, *SE* = .12, 95% CI = [.02, .47]. Ideal LAP was associated with marginally higher extraversion judgments of the neutral applicant, *B* = -.13, *SE* = .07, *Z* = -1.77, *p* = .08, 95% CI = [-.27, .02], which was associated with being more likely to hire the neutral applicant, *B* = .90, *SE* = .32, *Z* = 2.80, *p* = .01, 95% CI = [.27, 1.53]. Similarly, ideal HAP was associated with higher agreeableness judgments of the neutral applicant, *B* = .20, *SE* = .07, *t* = 2.75, *p* = .007, 95% CI = [.06, .34], which was also associated with being more likely to hire the neutral applicant, *B* = .89, *SE* = .41, *t* = 2.16, *p* = .03, 95% CI = [.08, 1.69]. However, there was no significant total effect of ideal LAP or HAP on choice of the neutral applicant before including extraversion and agreeableness judgments in the model, *p* = .32 to .59, and no direct effect after including these variables in the model, *p* = .28 to .92. Thus, similar to the results for excited applicants, ideal LAP may have indirectly influenced cultural differences in choice of the neutral applicant through extraversion judgments, and ideal HAP may have indirectly influenced cultural differences in choice of the neutral applicant through agreeableness judgments.